REMARKS

A petition for a further one month extension of time has today been filed as a separate paper and a copy is attached hereto. This amendment accompanies a request for continued examination and serves to supplement the Response filed September 6, 2005, entry of which has been requested in the accompanying paper.

Support for newly added claims 21-23 is found in paragraph [0024] of the substitute specification.

Further amendments made here were prompted by the remarks made by the examiner in a telephone conversation on September 12, 2005. In that telephone conversation the examiner questioned the method claims in that the cooling step of claim 7 might be so broadly worded as to read on cooling by contact with the ambient air. In this regard the examiner's attention is directed to the fact that in Matthews the lamination is conducted by heated rolls A and B. Matthews teaches that the heated rolls A are maintained at a temperature of between 160°F and 230°F (71-110°C) (column 5, lines 52-55) and that the B rolls "are operated at about the same temperature as the A rolls," quoting from column 5, lines 58-61 of Matthews. In accordance with applicants' claim 1, the cooling must be conducted down to a temperature of 8-30°C between the "compressing" (laminating) step and the transversely and longitudinally stretching step. In Matthews, the lamination is conducted by the heated rolls A and B. See column 6, lines 20-33. Accordingly, the only ambient cooling in the Matthews' process between the lamination and both longitudinal and transverse stretching is in the short distance

between the heated rollers B and the transverse stretching section 20. Since the heated rollers are at 160-230°F and the transverse stretching section is operated within the same temperature range (column 6, line 2), there would be very limited opportunity for the film to be cooled by ambient air to a temperature of 30°C (86°F) in the short span between heated rolls B and the transverse stretching assembly 20. Logically, the ambient air would not be able to cool from 160°F (71°C) to 86°F (30°C) within the short span between the heated rolls B and the heated stretcher assembly 20 of Matthews.

In applicants' Response After Final filed September 6, 2005, the cooling to 30°C of the film exiting the laminating unit (the compressing step) produces a thermal shock which, as applicants teach in paragraph 27 of their specification, "provides improved transpirability during the successive stretching operations." Neither Mathis nor Matthews suggest or disclose such a process, either alone or in combination.

Regarding claim 20, Van Cappellen in no way suggests positioning a cooling unit between the heated roller B of Matthews and the transverse stretcher assembly 20 of Matthews. The Mathis patent, as acknowledge by the examiner, "is not specific as to the stretching." Because Mathis does not disclose stretching, it could not have been obvious from any combination of Mathis, Matthews and Van Cappellen to locate a "cooling means" downstream of the laminating unit ("second calender") and a "stretching means" (nonexistent in Mathis).

The applicants also wish to take issue with the examiner's statement at page 2 of the Advisory Action ("attachment") which reads:

> Therefore, one in the art would appreciate that the apparatus of Van Cappellen could be used for either single or multi-layer films since the apparatus problem and solution are the same whether the film is single or multi-layer.

Applicants wish to point out that Van Cappellen cannot be used to produce a multi-layer or laminated film. The extruder head 11 of Van Cappellen extrudes a single film onto a quenching drum 12. No means for forming another film layer is disclosed. Of course, Van Cappellen also lacks a laminating unit or "second calender."

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS

10/3/2005
Date

George A. Loud
Reg. No. 25,814

Atty Dkt: LORI3001

625 Slaters Lane
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 683-0500